Attorney Docket No.: Q66561

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

U.S. Application No.: 09/989,161

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 9 and 11-13 are all the claims that have been examined in the application.

Claims 5-8 and 10 have been canceled. By this Amendment, Applicants add new claims 14-19.

Hence, claims 1-4, 9, and 11-19 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 11 are the only independent claims.

Miscellaneous

The undersigned thanks the Examiner for the new Office Action mailed 11/13/2007, addressing independent claim 13 in addition to claims 1-4, 9, and 11-12.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 9, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Camara et al. (US Patent No. 6,373,507 B1) in view of Universal Serial Bus (USB) Specification, Revision 1.0. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Examiner asserts that Camara teaches substantially all of the features of the independent claims, except for a buffer memory which outputs data at a variable rate depending on the data transfer rate of the network. The Examiner goes on to assert that the USB specification corrects this deficiency.

In the rejection of independent claim 1, the Examiner does not fully address USB Specification section 4.7.5, which makes it clear that bandwidth on a USB network is allocated depending on occupancy, i.e. the number of devices on a network. The available bandwidth has no bearing on the transfer rate of the network. The Examiner's reliance on the bulk transfer

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 U.S. Application No.: 09/989,161

relates to the time it takes for sufficient bandwidth to open on the network, e.g. occupancy, which is not inherently the network transfer rate.

Regarding the rejection of claim 11, in describing error recovery, USB specification section 8.6.3 and accompanying Figure 8-17 refer to the sides of the exchange as the transmitter and receiver. Section 10.5.3.1.3 states that bulk transfers may originate from either the host controller side or the client side of the transfer. Applicants respectfully submit that, in light of sections 4.5.1 and 4.5.2, which clearly state that the host controller is what retries a transmission while the client's role is described only as "recovery", the Examiner is mistaken in concluding that the USB specification makes it obvious that the buffer, i.e. the client, would re-transmit in the event of an error.

In addition, the Examiner cites a section of the USB specification where the sequence bit is not toggled for the missed ACK case. (See USB Specification page 158, 8.6.3, and 11/13/2007 Office Action, pages 3 and 7). This situation would require the buffer to maintain its contents until the affirmative acknowledgment is received. However, it is not inherent that the buffer could have sequential storage of read image data while outputting the image from the buffer. Applicants submit that the reading of image data into the buffer would have to be curtailed or else the USB buffer (prior to data ACK) would be lost in the event of missed data transmission.

Claims 1, 12, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shigyo et al. (US Patent No. 5,564,012) in view of Camara et al. and in further view of Universal Serial Bus (USB) Specification, Revision 1.0. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Attorney Docket No.: Q66561

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

U.S. Application No.: 09/989,161

In the rejection, the Examiner asserts that the USB specification teaches transmitting the data at a variable rate depending on the data transfer rate of the network, as above. Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments presented above with regard to the USB specification remain applicable to this rejection.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of independent claims 1 and 11 be withdrawn. Applicants further submit that claims 2-10 are allowable at least by virtue of their respective dependency from independent claim 1.

New Claims

By this Amendment, Applicants add new claims 14-15 to clarify that the network occupancy - and by extension the bandwidth - remains constant during operation for the present invention.

Applicants further add new claims 16-17 to clarify that the buffer memory of the present invention is sufficient to hold the entire image.

Applicants further add new claims 18-19 to clarify that the reading of the image data into the buffer occurs simultaneously with that data being transmitted over the network.

Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 14-19 are allowable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 or 11.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

U.S. Application No.: 09/989,161

Attorney Docket No.: Q66561

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Registration No. 41,239

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 7, 2008